

The proportion of various graphs in graph-designs

Richard M. Wilson

ABSTRACT. Let \mathcal{G} be a family of simple graphs. A \mathcal{G} -design on n points is a decomposition of the edges of K_n into copies of graphs in \mathcal{G} . In case that \mathcal{G} consists of complete graphs K_k with k in some set K of positive integers, such a \mathcal{G} -design is called a pairwise balanced design (PBD) on n points with block sizes from K . Here we are concerned with the possible proportions of the numbers of copies of graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}$ that appear in decompositions for large n . We extend a result of Colbourn and Rödl on PBDs to \mathcal{G} -designs, and give a further result on the possible numbers of copies of G in a \mathcal{G} -design containing each vertex of the complete graph K_n .

1. Introduction

For a positive integer n and a set K of positive integers, a 2 -($n, K, 1$) design consists of a set X of n points and a family \mathcal{A} of subsets of X , called blocks, so that $|A| \in K$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and every subset $\{x, y\}$ of two points in X is contained in a unique member of \mathcal{A} . These may also be called *pairwise balanced designs* (PBDs) with block sizes in K .

We use $\alpha(K)$ for the gcd (greatest common divisor) of $\{k - 1 : k \in K\}$ and $\beta(K)$ for the gcd of $\{k(k - 1) : k \in K\}$. It is known, see [4], that 2 -($n, K, 1$) designs exist for all integers n that are sufficiently large with respect to K and such that

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} n - 1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{\alpha(K)}, \\ n(n - 1) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\beta(K)}. \end{aligned}$$

These congruences are necessary conditions for the existence of a 2 -($n, K, 1$) design for any n .

The following theorem was proved by Colbourn and Rödl in [2].

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $K = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_\ell\}$ be given, where the integers k_i are distinct and at least 2. Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_ℓ be nonnegative real numbers that sum to 1, and let $\epsilon > 0$. For every sufficiently large integer n satisfying (1.1), there exists a 2 -($n, K, 1$) design in which the proportion of blocks of size k_i is within ϵ of p_i , simultaneously for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$.*

We give another proof of this theorem. It is no extra work to prove an extension of their result to graph-designs.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05B05, 05C70; Secondary 05C35, 05B39.

Key words and phrases. graph designs, complete graph, decompositions.

The author was supported in part by NSF Grant #0555755.

Let \mathcal{G} be a family of simple graphs. A \mathcal{G} -decomposition of a graph H is a set \mathcal{D} of edge-disjoint subgraphs of H , each subgraph in \mathcal{D} isomorphic to a member of \mathcal{G} , so that every edge belongs to exactly one member of \mathcal{D} . A \mathcal{G} -design on n points is a \mathcal{G} -decomposition of the complete graph K_n .

We use $\alpha(\mathcal{G})$ for the gcd of the degrees of the vertices of graphs in \mathcal{G} , and $\beta(\mathcal{G})$ for the gcd of $\{2|E(G)| : G \in \mathcal{G}\}$. It is known [3] that \mathcal{G} -designs on n points exist for all sufficiently large (with respect to \mathcal{G}) integers n satisfying

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} n-1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{\alpha(\mathcal{G})}, \\ n(n-1) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\beta(\mathcal{G})}. \end{aligned}$$

The congruences (1.2) are necessary conditions for the existence of \mathcal{G} -designs on n points for any n . In general, if there exists a \mathcal{G} -decomposition of H , then

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha(\{H\}) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\alpha(\mathcal{G})}, \\ \beta(\{H\}) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\beta(\mathcal{G})}. \end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_\ell\}$ be given, where the graphs G_i are pairwise nonisomorphic and where each has at least one edge. Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_ℓ be nonnegative real numbers that sum to 1, and let $\epsilon > 0$. For every sufficiently large integer n satisfying the congruences (1.2), there exists a \mathcal{G} -design in which the proportion of copies of G_i used in the decomposition is within ϵ of p_i for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$.*

It should be clear that Theorem 1.1 is the consequence of Theorem 1.2, when we take G_i to be a complete graph on k_i points. Theorem 1.2 and a corollary will be proved in Section 2. In Section 3, we prove the following theorem. It is stronger than Theorem 1.2.

THEOREM 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_\ell\}$ be given, where the graphs G_i are pairwise nonisomorphic and where each has at least one edge. Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_ℓ be nonnegative real numbers that sum to 1, and let $\epsilon > 0$. For every sufficiently large integer n satisfying the congruences (1.2), there exists a \mathcal{G} -design in which for every point x , the proportion of copies of G_i that appear in the decomposition and that contain x is within ϵ of p_i for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$.*

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Assume the hypothesis and notation of Theorem 1.2. It is sufficient to prove the theorem in the case that the p_i 's are rational numbers. Suppose that $p_i = s_i/t$ (with a common denominator t) and that t is large enough so that $1/t < \epsilon$.

Let H_0 be the vertex-disjoint union of s_i copies of G_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Let H_i be the vertex-disjoint union of H_0 and one additional copy of G_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, and let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_0, H_1, \dots, H_\ell\}$. In any graph H_i , the proportion of copies of G_i that appear is one of $s_i/(t+1)$, s_i/t , or $(s_i+1)/(t+1)$. Every \mathcal{H} -design immediately gives us a \mathcal{G} -design, in which the proportion of copies of G_i that appear is between $s_i/(t+1)$ and $(s_i+1)/(t+1)$, and this is within ϵ of p_i .

From [3], \mathcal{H} -designs on n points exist for all large integers n satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} n-1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{\alpha(\mathcal{H})}, \\ n(n-1) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\beta(\mathcal{H})}, \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$(2.2) \quad \alpha(\mathcal{H}) = \alpha(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\mathcal{H}) = \beta(\mathcal{G}),$$

i.e. that the congruences (1.2) and (2.1) are identical. This will complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

The set of degrees of vertices in graphs in \mathcal{H} is identical with the set of degrees of vertices in graphs in \mathcal{G} , so the left hand equation in (2.2) is trivial. It is also trivial that $\beta(\mathcal{G})$ divides $\beta(\mathcal{H})$. Finally, since $\beta(\mathcal{H})$ divides $2|E(H_j)|$ for all j , it divides the difference

$$2|E(H_i)| - 2|E(H_0)| = 2|E(G_i)|$$

for each i . Hence $\beta(\mathcal{H})$ divides the gcd of $2|E(G_i)|$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, which is $\beta(\mathcal{G})$. This establishes the right hand equation in (2.2). \square

By a G -packing \mathcal{P} in K_n we mean a set of edge-disjoint isomorphic copies of G in K_n .

COROLLARY 1. *Let G be a simple graph with at least one edge, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. For every sufficiently large integer n , there exists a G -packing \mathcal{P} of K_n so that the ratio of the number edges that occur in copies of G in \mathcal{P} to $n(n-1)/2$ is more than $1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.2 with $G_1 = G$, with G_2 a graph with a single edge, $p_1 = 1$, and $p_2 = 0$. For $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2\}$, we have $\alpha(\mathcal{G}) = 1$ and $\beta(\mathcal{G}) = 2$, so all integers n satisfy the congruences (1.2) in this case. \square

A much stronger result about packings of complete graphs into K_n will appear in [1].

3. Proof of Theorem 1.3

As in Section 2, we use the fact that if we have an \mathcal{A} -decomposition \mathcal{D}_B of each graph $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and a \mathcal{B} -decomposition of a graph H , then we naturally obtain an \mathcal{A} -decomposition \mathcal{D} of H , namely

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{D}_B.$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and suppose that for every vertex x of a graph $B \in \mathcal{B}$, the ratio of the number of copies of A in \mathcal{D}_B that contain x to the total number of graph in \mathcal{D}_B that contain x is within ϵ of a number p . Then for every vertex y of H , the ratio of the number of copies of A in \mathcal{D} that contain y to the total number of graph in \mathcal{D} that contain y is within ϵ of p .

It is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.3 in the case that the p_i 's are rational numbers, and we may also assume that they are positive. Suppose that $p_i = s_i/t$ (with a common denominator t , and where $s_i > 0$ for all i) and that t is large enough so that $1/t < \epsilon$.

Let u_i be the number of vertices of G_i . Let J be the edge disjoint union of Cs_i/u_i copies of G_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, where $C \geq 2$ is an integer chosen so that Cs_i/u_i is an integer for each i .

Label the vertices of J with positive integers in the range from 1 to N for some integer N so that the absolute values of the differences of the labels on adjacent vertices are distinct. For example, an (inefficient) way to do this is to use labels $2^0, 2^1, 2^2, \dots, 2^{v-1}$ in any order, where v is the number of vertices of J ; here $N =$

2^{v-1} . Identify the vertices of J with their labels in the (additive) group Z_{2N+1} of integers modulo $2N+1$, so that J is now a subgraph of the complete graph on vertex set Z_{2N+1} .

Let L_0 be the union of all translations $J+a$, $a \in Z_{2N+1}$. The condition on absolute values of the differences of labels ensures that the graphs $J+a$ are pairwise edge-disjoint. Because if $x, y \in Z_{2N+1}$ are adjacent in both $J+a$ and $J+b$, then $x-a, y-a$ are adjacent in J and $x-b, y-b$ are adjacent in J ; if these are not the ends of the same edge of J , then $d = \pm(x-y)$ modulo $2N+1$ appears as the difference of the labels of the ends of two edges of J ; but then $|d|$ is the difference of the labels of the ends of two edges of J .

So L_0 admits a decomposition into $2N+1$ copies of J , and then we obtain a \mathcal{G} -decomposition \mathcal{D}_0 of L_0 . The number of translates of a single copy of G_i that contain any given point $x \in Z_{2N+1}$ is u_i , so the number of copies of G_i in \mathcal{D}_0 that contain any point x is Cs_i . The total number of graphs in \mathcal{D}_0 that contain x is Ct .

Let L_j be obtained from L_0 by deleting the edges of one copy of G_j from L_0 , $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Of course, L_j has a \mathcal{G} -decomposition \mathcal{D}_j obtained by deleting that one copy of G_j from \mathcal{D} . Each point $x \in Z_{2N+1}$ is contained in either Cs_i or $Cs_i - 1$ copies of G_i in \mathcal{D}_j ; the total number of graphs in \mathcal{D}_j that contain x is Ct or $Ct - 1$. In any case, the proportion of copies of G_i among the graphs in \mathcal{D}_j that contain x is between $(Cs_i - 1)/(Ct)$ and $(Cs_i)/(Ct - 1)$, and is within $1/t < \epsilon$ of p_i .

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_0, L_1, \dots, L_\ell\}$. From [2], \mathcal{L} -designs on n points exist for all large integers n satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} n-1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{\alpha(\mathcal{L})}, \\ n(n-1) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\beta(\mathcal{L})}, \end{aligned}$$

From a \mathcal{L} -design, we obtain a \mathcal{G} -design using the \mathcal{G} -decompositions of L_i described above. For any point y , the proportion of copies of G_i among the graphs in the \mathcal{G} -decomposition that contain y will be within ϵ of p_i .

We claim that

$$(3.2) \quad \alpha(\mathcal{L}) = \alpha(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(\mathcal{L}) = \beta(\mathcal{G}),$$

i.e. that the congruences (1.3) and (3.1) are identical. This will complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

First, since each L_i has a \mathcal{G} -decomposition, $\alpha(\mathcal{G})$ divides $\alpha(\{L_i\})$ and $\beta(\mathcal{G})$ divides $\beta(\{L_i\})$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$. Hence $\alpha(\mathcal{G})$ divides $\alpha(\mathcal{L})$ and $\beta(\mathcal{G})$ divides $\beta(\mathcal{L})$.

If there is a vertex of degree d in some G_i , then, since one copy of G_i was deleted from L_0 to obtain L_i and L_0 is regular of degree Ct , then some point in Z_{2N+1} has degree Ct in L_0 and degree $Ct - d$ in L_i . Then $\alpha(\mathcal{L})$ divides these degrees and so divides the difference d . Since this is true for the degree d of every vertex of any graph in \mathcal{G} , $\alpha(\mathcal{L})$ divides $\alpha(\mathcal{G})$. Also, $\beta(\mathcal{L})$ divides $2|E(L_0)|$ and $2|E(L_i)|$, so it divides $2|E(L_0)| - 2|E(L_i)| = 2|E(G_i)|$ for each i , and hence $\beta(\mathcal{L})$ divides $\beta(\mathcal{G})$. This confirms (3.2). \square

References

1. Yeow Meng Chee, Charles J. Colbourn, Alan C. H. Ling, and Richard M. Wilson, *Covering and Packing for Pairs*, manuscript.
2. Charles J. Colbourn and Vojtech Rödl *Percentages in pairwise balanced designs*, Discrete Mathematics **77** (1989), 57–63.

3. Esther Lamken and Richard M. Wilson, *Decompositions of edge-colored complete graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **89** (2000), 149–200.
4. Richard M. Wilson, *An existence theory for pairwise balanced designs, III. Proof of the existence conjectures*, J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **18** (1975), 71–79.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, PASADENA, CALIFORNIA, 91125

Current address: Department of Mathematics, 253-37, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 91125

E-mail address: `rmw@caltech.edu`